Research Article

The Utilization of Language Styles by the Characters in the Movie *Oppenheimer*

Anak Agung Gde Bagus Rama Putra [1], I Gusti Ayu Gde Sosiowati [2], I Gusti Ayu Mahatma Agung [3],*

[1] English Department, Faculty of Humanities,Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia : ramaputra504@gmail.com
[2] English Department, Faculty of Humanities,Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia : gag_sosiowati@unud.ac.id
[3] English Department, Faculty of Humanities,Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia : ayu.mahatma@unud.ac.id

* Corresponding Author: I Gusti Ayu Mahatma Agung

Abstract: This article aims to identify the types of language styles utilized by the characters as well as to analyze the factors that influence its utilization in the movie Oppenheimer through the application of Joos' (1967) types of language styles theory and Holmes' (2013) social factors and dimensions theory. This article employed a qualitative method to analyze both the types of language styles and the factors that influence the characters to utilize different types of language styles in the movie Oppenheimer. In collecting the data, this article employed a documentation method and a note-taking technique. In analyzing the data, this article employed a descriptive qualitative method to ensure a detailed and thorough analysis of the data. In presenting the analysis, a descriptive qualitative method was employed to present the data thoroughly by using words and sentences. Based on the findings, the characters in the movie Oppenheimer utilized all types of language styles, which include frozen style, formal style, consultative style, casual style, and intimate style. Moreover, there are four main components that influence the characters to utilize different types of language styles, namely, participants, setting, topic, and function.

Keywords: Language Styles; Social Factors; Sociolinguistics

1. Introduction

Language is an essential component of human interactions, serving not only as a means for communicating, but also for distributing and exchanging information. Therefore, being a multifaceted and complex phenomenon, language is linked to the communities in which it exists. As proposed by Hudson (1996), sociolinguistics is a branch of study which explores the connection between language and society, particularly how linguistic choices are influenced by social factors, including class, gender, and ethnicity.

Within this framework, the concept of language styles emerges as a prominent area of study, focusing on the variations in language use that occur depending on the speaker, audience, and context. Jakobson (1960) defined language styles as how speakers select and arrange particular linguistic choices in conveying their intended messages. Language styles encompass the deliberate or subconscious choices individuals make in their speech, ranging from a formal one with its rigid form and complex vocabulary, to an informal one with its casualty and flexibility in expressing, each serving distinct communicative purposes. With these variations, Joos (1967) proposed that these language styles can be categorized into five different types according to their level of formality, which include frozen style, formal style, consultative style, casual style, and intimate style.

The phenomenon of language styles does not merely exist in real-world contexts only, but it is also evident in various media, including movies where the characters utilize various types of language styles in their dialogues and utterances. One prominent example of this phenomenon can be seen in the movie *Oppenheimer*, which revolves around the life of J. Robert Oppenheimer and his crucial role in developing the atomic bomb during World War II. In the movie itself, the characters are evidently utilizing various types of language styles, ranging from the most formal, frozen style, to the least formal, intimate style. The utilization of these styles was in line with the movie's narrative, which is to convey the challenges, discourses, and tension during the development of the atomic bomb.

International Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts, Culture, and Social Humanities
2025 , vol. 3, no. 2, Putra, et al.
48 of 56

Based on the phenomenon above, the movie *Oppenheimer* offers a compelling approach to examine the utilization of language styles in media discourse. While this movie not only exhibits the use of various types of language styles, but also underscores the broader significance of how these styles function in this particular context. Therefore, this article aims to identify the types of language styles, as well as to analyze the factors which influence the characters to utilize different types of language styles in the movie *Oppenheimer*.

2. Literature Review

A number of studies have been conducted regarding language styles in various contexts. For instance, a study conducted by Hutauruk et al (2022) analyzed the types of language styles that were used by singers in an interview. Another study conducted by Sanjaya (2023) analyzed the types of language styles used by a host in a talk show. Similarly, a study conducted by Febrianti et al (2023) unveiled the types of language styles used by a speaker in a talk show. Following next, a study conducted by Hidayati et al (2022) identified the types of language styles used by the characters in a novel. Another similar study was conducted by Puspasari et al (2023) which identified the types of language styles used by the main character in a movie.

While these prior studies share a few similarities in terms of their topic and theory, however, there are some disparities that can be highlighted. To begin with, most of the studies that have been conducted used various objects for their analysis, such as utterances from talk shows, interviews, novels, movies, and YouTube videos. On the contrary, this article solely focuses on using characters' utterances in a movie as its object of study. Moreover, these prior studies have yet to consider the factors which influence the use of different types of language styles. Therefore, to contribute to the growing body of research in this field, this article aims to analyze the types of language styles and the factors which influence their usage through the application of Joos' (1967) types of language styles theory, as well as Holmes' (2013) social factors and dimensions theory.

3. Method

In this article, a qualitative method was applied to analyze both the types of language styles and the factors which influence the use of different types of language styles in the movie *Oppenheimer*. The data of this article were taken from the biographical movie *Oppenheimer*, directed and written by Christopher Nolan. Based on the life of J. Robert Oppenheimer and his crucial role in developing the atomic bomb during World War II, this movie offers an intriguing approach to examine the language styles being used to portray the intellectual challenges, scientific discourses, the tension of political negotiations, and the emotional depth of personal relationships. In collecting the data, this article employed a documentation method and a note-taking technique. The first step being conducted to collect the data was watching the movie *Oppenheimer* with particular attention given to the characters' utterances. Following next, writing down the characters' utterances which exemplifies the use of different types of language styles with the note-taking technique. Lastly, identifying and classifying the collected data based on Joos' (1967) types of language styles theory.

In analyzing the data, a descriptive-qualitative method was applied in this article to achieve an in-depth analysis. Two theories were employed in this article, namely Joos' (1967) types of language styles theory and Holmes' (2013) social factors and dimensions theory. To analyze the data, Joos' (1967) theory was applied first in order to analyze the types of language style being used. Furthermore, Holmes' (2013) theory was applied thereafter in order to analyze the factors which influence the use of different types of language styles. In presenting the analysis, a descriptive-qualitative method was applied, where the method itself involves presenting the analysis in word description. To present the data, the chosen utterances were presented in the form of dialogues, then, the analysis was presented below in accordance with the utterances.

4. Results and Discussion

1. Frozen Style

Data 1
Hill   : "**From the standpoint of public welfare, the most injurious exercise of personal vindictiveness** in which Lewis Straus has engaged was in **the**

personnel security prosecution of J. Robert Oppenheimer, who had not hesitated to disagree with Mr Strauss on **certain questions of fundamental policy.**"

<div align="right">(Nolan, 2023)</div>

In data 1, the utterance from Hill exemplifies the use of **frozen style**. As proposed by Joos (1967), frozen style is defined by the absence of authoritative intonation in the utterances and the prohibition of the listeners or addressees from cross-questioning or responding to the speakers. This can be seen from how Hill delivered his messages in a clear and concise manner through one-way communication without the participation of the listeners. Given the fact that Hill was in a hearing room where he was reading his statement regarding Oppenheimer's security clearance, therefore, it was expected that Hill would deliver his messages like such. Moreover, the rigid form of the utterances, as well as the use of complex vocabularies which can be seen from the phrases "**from the standpoint of public welfare,**" "**the most injurious exercise of personal vindictiveness,**" "**the personnel security prosecution,**" and "**certain questions of fundamental policy,**" further signified the utterances as a frozen style as these vocabularies, which concern legal matters, are predominantly employed in certain contexts, in this case a hearing, where it demands precision, clarity, and a focus on factual or ethical arguments.

In accounting for the social factors and dimensions, there are a few components that influence Hill to utilize the frozen style in this particular context. First, the **participants** in the utterances are Hill and the hearing committee, where based on the status scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), all of which share a hierarchical relationship. In this context, Hill is considered to be in a less significant position or in a lower status than the others, hence, the use of frozen style. Moreover, based on the social-distance scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), Hill and the hearing committee are considered to be distant and have a low solidarity, given that Hill was merely a witness in the hearing itself. Following next, the **setting** of this utterance was taking place in a hearing, which is considered to be a formal setting. The public nature of a hearing implies that the utterance is intended for an audience, specifically the ones concerned with issues of governance, ethics, or scientific policy. Thus, the frozen style is particularly employed in this context. Moreover, the **topic** of the utterances concerns the personal vindictiveness of Lewis Strauss and its impact on Oppenheimer, specifically in the context of a personnel security prosecution. Lastly, the **function** of the utterances was referential, where Hill was conveying his testimony to evaluate how Strauss' actions had impacted Oppenheimer on various levels.

2. Formal Style

Data 2

Oppenheimer : "**Members of the Security Board**, the so-called **derogatory information** in **your indictment** of me **cannot be fairly understood** except in the context of my life and work. This answer is a summary of relevant aspects of my life in more or less chronological order."

<div align="right">(Nolan, 2023)</div>

In data 2, the utterance from Oppenheimer exemplifies the use of **formal style**. As proposed by Joos (1967), formal style is defined by its detachment to maintain objectivity and cohesion where the ideas flow logically between sentences. This can be seen from how Oppenheimer himself delivered the utterance in a structured way to maintain its cohesion, starting by addressing the audience "**Members of the Security Board**" and ending the utterance by stating its initial purpose, which is to summarize the relevant aspects of his life. In addition, Oppenheimer also delivered the utterance in a formal way which avoids the use of informal language, where it is in line with the characteristics of the formal style, such as the use of complex vocabularies, precise grammatical structures, and the lack of ellipsis and colloquial expressions. This can be seen from the phrases "**derogatory information,**" "**your indictment,**" and "**cannot be fairly understood,**" which signify a precise and structured use of language. Given that Oppenheimer aimed to convey accurate and logical information, this formal style is particularly suitable for the gravity of the situation and the formal context in which the statement was made.

In accounting for the social factors and dimensions, there are various components that influence Oppenheimer to utilize formal style in this context. To begin with, the **participants** in the utterances are Oppenheimer and the members of the security board. According to the

International Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts, Culture, and Social Humanities
2025 , vol. 3, no. 2, Putra, et al.
50 of 56

status scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), both Oppenheimer and the members share hierarchical relationship, where Oppenheimer was deemed to have less power as he was the defendant or the subject of the hearing, thus, being in a lower status which eventually required him to use a formal style. In addition, based on the social-distance scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), both Oppenheimer and the members of the security board are considered to be distant and have lower solidarity. Given such, Oppenheimer was then expected to utilize a formal style in addressing himself and communicating with the other participants. Furthermore, the **setting** of the utterance was in a hearing where it was conducted in a small private room. Similarly to data 1, the hearing can be classified into a formal setting where it was intended for a specified matter and audience, on this matter, Oppenheimer's security clearance. Thus, it was expected for the participants to use a formal style in this context. Following next, the **topic** of the utterance was Oppenheimer himself, where he made a summary of pivotal aspects of his life to clear the accusations that were made against him. Based on his past associations, Oppenheimer was said to involve himself with communist-affiliated people, therefore, he was considered to pose a security risk to the United States. Given the gravity of the topic, a formal style was suitable to be utilized by Oppenheimer in this particular context. Lastly, the **function** of the interaction was referential, where Oppenheimer was conveying information regarding his life. Given their relationship, the significance of the topic, and the social dynamics at play, the formal language style is therefore the most appropriate to be used in this context.

3. Consultative Style

Data 3

Oppenheimer : "**Can you run the calculations yourself?**"
Einstein : "**About the only thing you and I share is a disdain for mathematics. Who's working on it at Berkeley?**"
Oppenheimer : "**Hans Bethe.**"
Einstein : "He'll get to the truth."
Oppenheimer : "**And if the truth is catastrophic?**"
Einstein : "**Then you stop**. And share your findings with the Nazis, so neither side destroys the world."

(Nolan, 2023)

In data 3, the conversation between Oppenheimer and Einstein exemplifies the use of **consultative style**. As proposed by Joos (1967), the consultative style is mostly employed in semi-formal situations, such as meetings, face-to-face discussions, and daily conversations. It is in line with the conversation above as both Oppenheimer and Einstein were involved in a face-to-face discussion. In addition, Joos (1967) also stated that the consultative style is characterized by the constant provision of information by the speakers and continuous participation from the addressees. Hence, the prominent use of questions and requests for clarification is commonly evident in this style. This can be seen from the utterances "**Can you run the calculations yourself?**" and "**About the only thing you and I share is a disdain for mathematics,**" where both Oppenheimer and Einstein were exchanging information regarding the calculations that Oppenheimer had made prior. Furthermore, in the utterances "**Who's working on it at Berkeley?**" and "**Hans Bethe,**" both of them continued to exchange information, where it was implied that the calculations had yet to be finished and it was still being worked on by Hans Bethe. And lastly, in the utterances "**And if the truth is catastrophic?**" and "**Then you stop**" both indicated the provision of information and the continuous participation of the participants, where in this context Oppenheimer asked Einstein what would have happened if the truth of the calculations was catastrophic. The utterances can thus be categorized as consultative style due to the ongoing conversations and the frequent usage of questions and requests for explanation by the participants.

In accounting for the social factors and dimensions, there are various components which influence Oppenheimer and Einstein to utilize the consultative style in this context. First, the **participants** in the conversation were Oppenheimer and Einstein, where based on the status scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), both Oppenheimer and Einstein shared hierarchical relationships, where Oppenheimer was in a more subordinate position than Einstein. Although both of them were renowned scientists, however, Einstein was portrayed as more of a mentor or advisor whom Oppenheimer sought information and guidance for. Therefore, based on this

International Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts, Culture, and Social Humanities
2025 , vol. 3, no. 2, Putra, et al.
51 of 56

hierarchical feature, Oppenheimer was asked to talk with Einstein in a courteous yet engaged manner that allowed both questioning and answering while also upholding formality at the same time. In addition, based on the social-distance scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), the relationship between Oppenheimer and Einstein was considered to be moderate, thus, resulting in a mixture of formal and informal language use. Following next, the **setting** of the conversation was taking place in a pond near Einstein's residence, where the place itself was classified as an informal setting, thus, it does not strictly require formal language use. Furthermore, the **topic** of the conversation was about Oppenheimer's calculations and its further consequences. Lastly, the **function** of the utterances was referential, where Oppenheimer conveyed the information regarding the calculations to Einstein. Consequently, considering their professional relationship, the gravity of the matter, and the social dynamics involved, the consultative language style is the most suitable option to be utilized in this context.

Data 4
Groves : "**Is that...?**"
Oppenheimer : "**Mrs Serber**. I've offered jobs to all the wives. Admin, librarians, computation. We cut down on staff and keep families together."
Groves : "**Are these women qualified?**"
Oppenheimer : "**Don't be absurd**. These are some of the brightest minds in our community."

(Nolan, 2023)

In data 4, the conversation between Oppenheimer and Groves exemplifies the use of **consultative style**. As proposed by Joos (1967), consultative style is mostly employed in semi-formal situations, where in this context, both Groves and Oppenheimer were involved in a face-to-face discussion regarding the employment of the women who reside in Los Alamos. In addition, Joos (1967) also stated that consultative style is characterized by the constant provision of information by the speakers and continuous participation from the addressees, or in other words, a two-way conversation where both parties are involved. Hence, the prominent use of questions and requests for clarification are commonly evident in this style. This can be seen from the utterances "**Is that...?**," "**Mrs Serber**," "**Are these women qualified?**," and "**Don't be absurd**," where all of these utterances indicate the constant action of providing information and participating in the conversations. The utterances, "**Is that...?**" and "**Mrs Serber**," showed how Grove was a bit taken aback when he saw a woman was employed to replace the existing staff, in which Oppenheimer responded by stating the woman's name, Mrs Serber. Moreover, the utterances, "**Are these women qualified?**" and "**Don't be absurd**," showed the continuation of Grove and Oppenheimer's conversation, where Grove was conveying his concern to Oppenheimer whether the women he employed were qualified. It was then followed by Oppenheimer's response where he assured Groves that these women were indeed qualified. Based on the continuous conversations and the frequent use of questions and requests for clarification amongst the participants, the utterances can therefore be classified as consultative style.

In accounting for the social factors and dimensions, there are various components which influence Groves and Oppenheimer to utilize consultative style in this context. To begin with, the **participants** of the conversation are Grove and Oppenheimer. According to the status scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), both Grove and Oppenheimer share hierarchical relationships, where Oppenheimer was in a more subordinate position than Grove. This was due to the fact that Grove was the head of the Manhattan Military Project, where Oppenheimer was the one who worked for him in this context. Despite their disparities in working position, Groves initially acknowledged Oppenheimer's exceptional capacity to guide the project and bring the scientific team together, and therefore, they grew to trust one another to collaborate in their work. Hence, Oppenheimer was able to communicate with Grove in a considerate yet involved way that maintains formality using consultative style. Moreover, based on the social-distance scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), the relationship between Oppenheimer and Grove was considered to be moderate, thus, resulting in a mixture of formal and informal language use. Following next, the **topic** of the conversation revolved around the employment of the women who reside in Los Alamos. Lastly, the **function** of the conversation was referential, where Oppenheimer was informing Groves regarding the employment of Los Alamos' women as he had not known better prior to seeing Mrs Serber working there. Therefore, based on their

International Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts, Culture, and Social Humanities
2025 , vol. 3, no. 2, Putra, et al.

52 of 56

relationship, the importance of the topic, and the social dynamics involved, the consultative language style is the most suitable option to be utilized in this context.

Data 5

Robb : "And in the months between your interview with Dr. Oppenheimer and his eventual naming of Chevalier, **did you expend resources trying to find the identity of the intermediary?**"

Pash : "**Considerable resources**. Without the name our job was extremely difficult."

Robb : "**When did you receive the name?**"

Pash : "**I was gone by the time Oppenheimer offered it up**."

(Nolan, 2023)

In data 5, the conversation between Robb and Pash exemplifies the use of **consultative style**. As proposed by Joos (1967), consultative style is mostly employed in semi-formal situations, such as meetings, face-to-face discussions, and daily conversations. It is in line with the conversation above as both Robb and Pas were involved in a face-to-face discussion, where both of them were discussing the identity of the intermediary whom was revealed to be Chevalier. In addition, Joos (1967) also stated that consultative style is characterized by the constant provision of information by the speakers and the continuous participation from the addressees. Therefore, the prominent use of questions and requests for clarification is commonly evident in this style. This can be seen from the utterances "**Did you expend resources trying to find the identity of the intermediary?**," "**Considerable resources**," "**When did you receive the name?**," and "**I was gone by the time Oppenheimer offered it up**." These utterances exhibit the ongoing conversation between Robb and Pash, where the utterances, "**Did you expend resources trying to find the identity of the intermediary?**" and "**Considerable resources**" show how Robb inquired a question to Pash whether he spent any resources to unveil the intermediary's identity, to which Pash responded by saying that he indeed spent considerable resources in his act. Furthermore, the utterances, "**When did you receive the name?**" and "**I was gone by the time Oppenheimer offered it up**" showed the continuation of their conversation where Robb yet again inquired a question to which he asked Pash when he had received the name of the intermediary. It was then followed by Pash's participation where he stated that he had not received the name as he was already gone by the time Oppenheimer offered it up. Thus, the utterances above can be categorized as consultative style based on the ongoing discussions and the frequent usage of questions and requests for clarification between the participants.

In accounting for the social factors and dimensions, there are various components which influence Robb and Pash to utilize consultative style in this context. To begin with, the **participants** of the conversation are Robb and Pash, where based on the status scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), both of them share hierarchical relationships, in which Pash was in a more subordinate position than Robb. This was due to the fact that Robb was serving as the hearing committee where he had the authority to interview the witness or the one being questioned, Pash. Given the circumstances, both Robb and Pash were able to communicate with each other in a considerate yet involved way that maintains formality. In addition, based on the social-distance scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), the relationship between Robb and Pash was considered to be moderate, thus, resulting in a mixture of formal and informal language use as they are neither close nor distant in terms of their relationship. Following next, the **topic** of the conversation was the statement from the witness regarding the matter involving the disclosure of the intermediary's identity. While the topic is neither too formal nor too informal, therefore, the combination of both languages is suitable in this context, particularly through the utilization of consultative style. Lastly, the **function** of the conversation is referential, which can be seen from the way Pash informs Robb of what he has done so far in finding the intermediary's identity.

Data 6

Stimson : "**Enough to unleash the atomic bomb?**"

Fermi : "**In truth, the A-bomb might not cause as much damage as the Tokyo bombings**."

Stimson : "**What are we estimating?**"

Bush : "**In a medium-sized city, twenty or thirty thousand dead**."

(Nolan, 2023)

In data 6, the conversation between Stimson, Fermi, and Bush exemplifies the use of **consultative style**. As proposed by Joos (1967), consultative style is mostly employed in semi-formal situations, where in this context, all of the participants were discussing the impact of using the atomic bomb during World War II in a face-to-face discussion. In addition, Joos (1967) also stated that consultative style is characterized by the constant provision of information by the speakers and continuous participation from the addressees, or in other words, a two-way conversation where all of the parties are involved. Hence, the prominent use of questions and requests for clarification is commonly evident in this style. This can be seen from the utterance "**Enough to unleash the atomic bomb?**" where Stimson inquired a question whether it would be justifiable enough to unleash the atomic bomb during the war. It was then followed by Fermi's response which can be seen from the utterance "**In truth, the A-bomb might not cause as much damage as the Tokyo bombings**," stating that the atomic bomb might not cause much damage. Furthermore, intrigued by the answer, Stimson inquired a question once again "**What are we estimating?**," asking how much the impact would escalate if the atomic bomb were used, in which was responded by Bush "**In a medium-sized city, twenty or thirty thousand dead**," stating the escalation of the impact. Therefore, based on the ongoing conversations and the constant use of questions and requests for clarification between the participants, the utterances above can be classified into consultative style.

In accounting for the social factors and dimensions, there are various components which influence Stimson, Fermi, and Bush to utilize consultative style in this context. To begin with, the **participants** of the conversation are Stimson, Fermi, and Bush. According to the status scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), all of the participants share hierarchical relationships, where Stimson has the highest power or authority, given his role as the U.S. secretary of war. On the other hand, both Fermi and Bush were in a more subordinate position, where in this context they were the ones working for Stimson. Despite the disparities, the speakers were peers engaged in a high-stake professional conversation that demanded factual accuracy, mutual respect, and clarity. Hence, they were able to communicate with one another in a considerate yet involved way that maintains formality using consultative style. Moreover, based on the social-distance scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), the relationship between Stimson, Fermi, and Bush was considered to be moderate, thus, resulting in a mixture of formal and informal language use. Following next, the **topic** of the conversation revolved around the impact of using atomic bombs during World War II. Lastly, the **function** of the conversation was referential, where Fermi and Bush were informing Stimson regarding the implications and impact if the atomic bomb were used. Therefore, based on their relationship, the importance of the topic, and the social dynamics involved, the consultative language style is the most suitable option to be utilized in this context.

4. Casual Style

Data 7
Groves   : "Why's Fermi still taking **side bets** on it?"
Oppenheimer : "**Call it gallows humour**."

(Nolan, 2023)

In data 7, the conversation between Groves and Oppenheimer exemplifies the use of **casual style**. As proposed by Joos (1967), casual style is mostly employed in informal situations, mainly among friends, acquaintances, or family members. Given that Groves and Oppenheimer were close acquaintances at that time for working together on the Manhattan Project to develop the atomic bomb. In addition, Joos (1967) stated the casual style is characterized by the use of ellipses and slang as it is assumed that in this particular style, both the speakers and addressees have the same views or understanding regarding the context of the situations. In the conversation, both Groves and Oppenheimer can be seen using some slang expressions, such as "**side bets**" and "**gallows humor**." In literal meaning, "**side bets**" is a bet or wager that is made aside from the main one, however, in this context, it was used as a slang expression to state that Fermi was making personal bets on whether the atomic bomb would work, how destructive it will be, or even whether it might ignite the atmosphere. In addition, "**gallows humor**" is defined as a form of dark humor that makes light of important, unsettling, or traumatic events, where in this context, it was used as a slang

expression to refer Fermi's decision on betting on the atomic bomb testing. Moreover, the use of the ellipsis "**Call it gallows humor**," further indicates the use of casual style in this context. While the phrase could have been structured properly, however, Oppenheimer decided to deliver it in a short and concise manner by omitting the subject. It is in line with the nature of casual style, where it is assumed that both the speakers and listeners share a similar understanding of the context, hence, reducing the urgency to convey elaborate explanations and to use thorough wordings.

In accounting for the social factors and dimensions, there are various components which influence Groves and Oppenheimer to utilize casual style in this context. To begin with, the **participants** of the conversation are Groves and Oppenheimer, where based on the status scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), both of them share hierarchical relationships, in which Oppenheimer was in a more subordinate position than Groves. Referring to data 4, despite of their disparities in working position, they grew to trust one another to collaborate in their work. Hence, both Groves and Oppenheimer were able to communicate in a more casual and relaxed way. In addition, based on the social-distance scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), the relationship between Groves and Oppenheimer was considered to be moderate, thus, making it feasible for them to communicate in a more casual way. Following next, the **setting** of the conversation was located in an observation post where the atomic bomb would be tested. Given that the location was considered to be informal, hence, casual language is most likely to be employed in this context. Moreover, the **topic** of the conversation was Fermi's bet for the atomic bomb test despite its uncertainty. Therefore, in joking about the situation, the use of casual language is suitable in this context, particularly through the utilization of casual style. Lastly, the **function** of the conversation was affective, which can be seen from the way Groves and Oppenheimer were joking about Fermi's bet.

Data 8
Oppenheimer : "Hans. Yes, he's here. Yes. Is he wrong?"
Kistiakowsky : "**No**."
Oppenheimer : "So we're about to fire **a dud**?"
Kistiakowsky : "**No**."

(Nolan, 2023)

In data 8, the conversation between Oppenheimer and Kistiakowsky exemplifies the use of **casual style**. As proposed by Joos (1967), casual style is mostly employed in informal situations, mainly among friends, acquaintances, or family members. This was due to the fact that Oppenheimer and Kistiakowsky were close acquaintances at that time for working together on the Manhattan Project to develop the atomic bomb. In the conversation, Oppenheimer can be seen using a slang expression, namely, "**a dud**." While "**a dud**" has the meaning of something that fails to work properly, however, in this context, it was used as a slang expression to refer to the bomb that was about to be tested as it had a slight chance to fail, hence, referred to as "**a dud**." In addition, Kistiakowsky's concise expression "**No**" further indicates the use of casual style in this context. Although Kistiakowsky could have responded to Oppenheimer's question properly, he decided to respond in a short and concise manner. It is in line with the nature of casual style, where it is assumed that both the speakers and listeners share a similar understanding of the context, hence, reducing the urgency to convey elaborate explanations and to use thorough wordings.

In accounting for the social factors and dimensions, there are various components which influence Oppenheimer and Kistiakowsky to utilize casual style in this context. To begin with, the **participants** of the conversation are Groves and Oppenheimer, where based on the status scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), both of them are on the same status or position as they were scientists who were working on the development of the atomic bomb. Hence, both Oppenheimer and Kistiakowsky were able to communicate in a more casual and relaxed way. In addition, based on the social-distance scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), the relationship between Groves and Oppenheimer was considered to be close, thus, making it feasible for them to communicate in a more casual way. Moreover, the **topic** of the conversation was about the possibility of the bomb failing during the test. Therefore, in making light of the situation, the use of casual language is suitable in this context, particularly through the utilization of casual style. Lastly, the **function** of the conversation was affective, which can be seen from the way Oppenheimer expressed his worry to Kistiakowsky.

Data 9
Nichols   : "**Hoover passes them to McCarthy?**"
Strauss   : "Oppenheimer's too slippery for that self-promoting **clown**."

(Nolan, 2023)

In data 9, the conversation between Nichols and Straus exemplifies the use of **casual style**. As proposed by Joos (1967), casual style is mostly employed in informal situations, mainly among friends, acquaintances, or family members. As Nichols and Straus were working together at the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), therefore, they eventually became close acquaintances at that time. In addition, Joos (1967) stated the casual style is characterized by the use of ellipses and slang as it is assumed that in this particular style, both the speakers and addressees have the same views or understanding regarding the context of the situations. In the conversation, both Nichols and Straus can be seen using an ellipsis and a slang expression, such as, "**Hoover passes them to McCarthy?**" and "**clown**." In literal meaning, "**clown**" refers to an entertainer, particularly in a circus, who wears exaggerated costumes and makeup. However, in this context, Strauss used the term as a slang expression to refer to McCarthy as someone who acts stupid. Moreover, the use of the ellipsis "**Hoover passes them to McCarthy?**" further indicates the use of casual style in this context. While the phrase could have been structured properly, however, Nichols decided to deliver it in a short and concise manner by omitting some parts of the phrase. It is in line with the nature of casual style, where it is assumed that both the speakers and listeners share a similar understanding of the context, hence, reducing the urgency to convey elaborate explanations and to use thorough wordings.

In accounting for the social factors and dimensions, there are various components which influence Nichols and Straus to utilize casual style in this context. To begin with, the **participants** of the conversation are Nichols and Straus, where based on the status scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), both of them are on the same status or position as they were the stakeholders at the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC). Hence, Nichols and Straus were able to communicate in a more casual and relaxed way. In addition, based on the social-distance scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), the relationship between Nichols and Straus was considered to be close, thus, making it feasible for them to communicate in a more casual way. Moreover, the **topic** of the conversation was Hoover's tactic to damage Oppenheimer's reputation by giving McCarthy some classified information regarding his past left-wing affiliation which eventually angered Strauss. Therefore, the use of casual language is suitable in this context, particularly through the utilization of casual style. Lastly, the **function** of the conversation was affective, which can be seen from the way Strauss expressed his resentment towards McCarthy to Nichols.

5. Intimate Style

Data 10
Serber   : "We can't know what it might do to your reproductive system- **Donald**, **help me out**, here."
Donald   : "You're on your own, **pal**."

(Nolan, 2023)

In data 10, the conversation between Serber and Donald exemplify the use of **intimate style**. As proposed by Joos (1967), intimate style is mostly employed in informal situations where the participants happen to share a close or intimate relationship. Given the fact that both Serber and Donald were scientists who worked on the development of the atomic bomb in Los Alamos, therefore, they had become close colleagues at that time. Hence, they were communicating with each other in a casual and relaxed manner. In addition, Joos (1967) also stated this style is mostly characterized by the use of personalized address terms among the speakers. In the conversation, both Serber and Donald can be seen using these terms, namely, "**Donald**" and "**pal**." Initially, while asking for help, Serber referred to Donald using his name instead of using formal terms. Moreover, in response to Serber's request, Donald denied it implicitly by stating "You're on your own, **pal**," which includes a personalized term "**pal**" to address Serber. Based on the use of these personalized terms, it indicates a close relationship between the participants of the conversation as people with such relationships are more likely to address one another informally or using their preferred terms. In addition, the way Serber's request lacks proper wording and structuring which can be seen from the

utterance "**help me out**" further indicates the use of casual style in this particular context. Although Serber could have conveyed his request properly, he instead delivered it in a simpler way. It is also in line with Joos' (1967) characteristic of intimate style, where in this style, it is assumed that both the speakers and listeners already have an understanding of the context, hence reducing the urgency to convey the message explicitly.

In accounting for the social factors and dimensions, there are various components which influence Serber and Donald to utilize intimate style in this context. To begin with, the **participants** of the conversation are Serber and Donald, where based on the status scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), both of them are on the same status or position, being scientists working on the development of the atomic bomb in Los Alamos. Hence, Serber and Donald were able to communicate in a more casual and relaxed way. In addition, based on the social-distance scale (Holmes, 2013, p. 12), the relationship between Serber and Donald was considered to be close, thus making it feasible for them to communicate in a more casual way. Moreover, the **topic** of the conversation was about the potential dangers of radiation exposure to their reproductive system. Given such, the use of casual language is suitable in this context, particularly through the utilization of an intimate style. Finally, the **function** of the conversation was affective, which can be seen from the way Serber expressed his worry about the radiation to Donald, to which Donald responded sarcastically.

5. Conclusions

Based on the findings and the analysis above, there are a few important points to be highlighted in this section. To begin with, it can be concluded that the characters in the movie *Oppenheimer* utilized all types of language styles accordingly with a total of 10 data, which includes 1 data of frozen style, 1 data of formal style, 4 data of consultative style, 3 data of casual style, and 1 data of intimate style. The most common type of language style used in the movie was consultative style, as this style was mostly employed in face-to-face conversations, in which the characters were frequently engaged in. Following next, it can also be concluded that there are four main components that influence the characters to utilize different types of language styles, namely, participants, setting, topic, and function. However, in the context of the analysis above, not all of the components were relevant to influence the characters to utilize a particular type of language style. Nevertheless, this article has been able to shed new light on understanding the utilization of language styles in the context of cinematic narratives. Future researches are expected in order to contribute a better understanding of this field, particularly in different contexts or objects of study.

References

[1] J. W. Creswell and J. D. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2018.

[2] N. Febrianti, D. Efendi, and D. Oktariza, "Language Style Used in Oprah Winfrey's Talk Show on YouTube," *Krinok: Jurnal Linguistik Budaya*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 91–100, 2023. doi: https://doi.org/10.36355/krinok.v7i2.1273

[3] E. Febrina, A. Zahara, A. A. C. Putri, and R. Rangkuti, "The Analysis of Language Style Used in Merry Riana's YouTube Channel on the Playlist 'Spoken Word'," *Bahtera*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 137–153, 2023. doi: https://doi.org/10.21009/bahtera.222.02

[4] L. Hidayati, D. Syahputri, and L. A. Rangkuti, "Analysis of Language Style in Novel Dialogue: The Maze Runner," *Excellence: Journal of English and English Education*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 33–39, 2022. doi: https://doi.org/10.47662/ejeee.v2i2.514

[5] J. Holmes, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 4th ed. London, UK: Routledge, 2013.

[6] R. A. Hudson, *Sociolinguistics*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

[7] B. Hutauruk, P. Sihombing, F. Lestari, and D. Hutahaean, "Language Style Analysis Used by Agnez Mo and Rich Bryan's Interview on Asia Pop and Build Series," *Indonesian Journal of Education, Social Sciences and Research (IJESSR)*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 42–50, 2022. doi: https://doi.org/10.30596/ijessr.v3i1.9868

[8] R. Jakobson and M. Halle, *Fundamentals of Language*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 1960.

[9] M. Joos, *The Five Clocks*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967.

[10] N. P. N. Puspasari, I. M. Rajeg, and I. N. Sudipa, "Language Style Used by the Main Character in Hotel Transylvania 2 Movie," International Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts, Culture, and Social Humanities (*IJELLACUSH*), vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 119–132, May 2023. doi: https://doi.org/10.59024/ijellacush.v1i2.138

[11] A. G. Sanjaya and E. R. Linuwih, "Language Style Used by James Corden in the Late Late Show," *E-Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 220–229, 2023. doi: https://doi.org/10.24843/e-jl.2023.v17.i02.p12